

1956

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

5663

pricewise, in the export market, the cotton producers would make their contribution toward the solution of the overall problem by accepting a moderately lower support price, thereby improving cotton's competitive position with synthetics in the domestic market.

The cotton growers' organizations agreed to accept price reductions of from 3 to 3½ cents a pound in order to make cotton competitive with rayon. Under the 82½ percent of parity, which was announced today in the President's veto message, cotton prices will be reduced only about 2½ cents a pound. That is a rough estimate, which is very close to being correct.

So far as cotton is concerned, the main thing wrong with H. R. 12 was that it would have provided a return to a rigid system of price supports, thereby holding a price umbrella over domestic synthetic fiber production, which would have made impossible an improvement in the position of cotton in competition with rayon in the domestic market, and would have seriously impaired our chances for obtaining the kind of export program for cotton which would have been really adequate in effectively meeting foreign price competition from foreign-produced cotton and synthetics.

It was for this reason, which dealt with the very heart of cotton's most serious problem, that I felt compelled to vote against the conference report. That is not to say that there were not a number of provisions in H. R. 12 which were constructive and urgently needed, so far as cotton is concerned.

Mr. President, what is necessary is to establish a minimum acreage allotment for cotton for the years 1957 and 1958. Otherwise, there will be an additional reduction in the acreage allotment for 1957 of 8.9 percent, as I have said, and a further acreage reduction in 1958 of, roughly, 6 percent. Mississippi would take an acreage reduction of, roughly, 8 percent. Acreage reductions are destructive of the industry, tend to pull down farm income, and, if continued, there will be no way whereby a cotton farm can be operated at a profit.

Furthermore, in the South there are millions of small farmers who plant 4 acres of cotton or less. They must be provided for by appropriate legislation.

Third, H. R. 12 contained a provision which would clear up the question as to whether the President had the authority to deal with the problem of textile imports by negotiation with the individual countries from which such imports emanate.

Fourth, the bill contained a provision to rectify a very serious injustice which is being worked upon the producers of extra long staple cotton.

Fifth, the bill contained provisions for the soil bank, which would have made possible further voluntary reductions in production, without the loss of net income to farmers.

Mr. President, I therefore feel that the most constructive course we could now pursue would be to delete from H. R. 12 the specific provisions to which the President has objected so seriously, and re-

turn to him the remainder of the bill without further delay.

It would be a simple matter for the Congress to follow this course, and place upon the President's desk a farm bill which he could sign before the end of this week.

I urge my colleagues to take such action as is necessary to bring this about.

#### CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY— DOCUMENTS FURNISHED BY SENATOR MCCARTHY

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I wish to give the Senate some information.

A few days ago when the Senate was considering the CIA joint resolution I stated that if the resolution were passed I would turn over to the proposed new joint committee some 50 or more documents having to do with everything from incompetence to communism in the CIA. The resolution failed, and the joint committee was not established.

The question arose as to whether the information should go to the Armed Services Committee, headed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], to the Permanent Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, headed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], or to the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. I felt that the Internal Security Subcommittee had the most complete jurisdiction of the subject, so I have turned over the documents, as of today, to the subcommittee of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], not because I preferred that subcommittee to the other committee but because I thought that it had unquestionable jurisdiction on the subject.

I know they will have difficulty getting the witnesses from the CIA. They refused to appear before our committee. However, I hope that we will test on the Senate floor the right of the Internal Security Subcommittee to get the necessary information. For that reason I have turned over all the pertinent material to the Eastland committee.

#### PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES IN THE FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION AND INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 97) to amend certain laws providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Food and Agriculture Organization and International Labor Organization and authorizing appropriations therefor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the unfinished business, which is Senate Joint Resolution 97. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment heretofore proposed by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, this joint resolution authorizes an increase in the ceiling on the authorized United States contribution to the Food and Agriculture Organization from \$2 million a year to \$3 million a year. It also authorizes an increase in the ceiling on the authorized contribution to the International Labor Organization from \$1,750,000 a year to \$3 million a year.

The joint resolution was reported unanimously by the Committee on Foreign Relations on July 27 of last year. It was considered briefly in the Senate July 30, but no action was taken in the adjournment rush.

When Congress reconvened in January, the Committee on Foreign Relations again considered the matter in the light of developments in the intervening months. After discussion with Assistant Secretary of State Francis O. Wilcox and Assistant Secretary of Labor J. Ernest Wilkins, and after further consideration, the committee saw no reason to change the position which it had taken last July—namely, that the resolution is a meritorious one and should be passed.

Indeed, Mr. President, passage of the resolution is daily becoming more urgent, particularly so far as the ILO is concerned. Let me review the situation briefly for the Senate.

At a meeting in March of this year, the ILO governing body adopted a budget for the calendar year 1957 amounting to a net of \$7½ million. The vote, by the way, was 28 to 10, with the United States voting "No." This budget will be presented to the ILO Conference in June for final approval; but in view of the almost three to one vote of the governing body, there is little reason to anticipate contrary action by the Conference.

On the basis of 25 percent, which is the current rate of assessment of the United States in the ILO this budget will call for a United States contribution of \$1.9 million. The net contribution can be reduced to \$1.8 million by taking advantage of an expected credit account from earlier years; but, even so, our assessment will be \$50,000 above the existing statutory ceiling.

Thus, it is clear that the United States will be confronted with an assessment which it cannot pay unless Congress raises the ceiling. Although this budget is for 1957, and we would not actually be in default until that time, our influence at the June conference would obviously

April 10

5664

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

be at a low ebb if we went there with the whole world knowing that we would be unable to meet our obligations. An organization does not pay much attention to the thoughts of a member who is avowedly about to refuse to pay his dues.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, our delinquency might turn out to be even greater than the figure of \$50,000 which I mentioned. That figure was based on a calculation of our assessment at the rate of 25 percent. That rate has been in effect since 1951, and there has been growing pressure within the ILO to revise all assessments to bring them more into line with the United Nations scale, under which the United States pays 33.3 percent. I do not think that the ILO would undertake such a drastic revision in one step, but I do think we have to anticipate some increase in the percentage of our assessment.

The question has been raised as to whether we should continue to participate at all in the ILO; or, if we do continue to participate, whether we should increase our contributions. To state the question another way, we have three possible courses of action:

First. We can withdraw entirely from the ILO. For reasons which I shall elaborate on a little later, this would not be a wise course for us to take, but it would at least have the merits of being forthright and unequivocal.

Second. We can defeat this bill and continue in the ILO under our present legislation. This, I think, is probably the worst thing we could do. We would be half in, half out, delinquent in our assessments, utterly without influence, and in general offering an altogether sorry spectacle for a Nation which is supposed to be in a position of world leadership.

Third. We can pass this measure and continue to participate in the ILO on a vigorous, wholehearted, full-membership basis. This seems to me to be clearly the wisest course for us to take. If we are going to belong to an organization as important as the ILO, we ought to belong to it all the way—we ought to work in it and try to get our ideas adopted by it. We ought to take a seat up in front, and not one by the door, where we can walk out every time something does not go to suit us or where the other members can throw us out for nonpayment of dues.

The ILO is unique among international organizations in that its delegates represent private groups, as well as governments. Each member of the ILO has two government delegates, plus one delegate representing employers, and one representing workers. The organization was established in 1919 to promote the voluntary cooperation of nations in improving working and living conditions. The United States has been a member since 1934.

The principal impetus for United States withdrawal from the ILO at this time comes from Mr. William McGrath, who was the American employer delegate in 1954 and 1955. In his public statements, Mr. McGrath has voiced numerous complaints about the ILO; but so far as I can determine, all of them come under three main headings:

First, a great many foolish proposals are advanced in the ILO. While Mr. McGrath evidently differs with a good many persons, even in his own country, as to what is foolish and what is not, I think we can all agree that there are some foolish proposals advanced in the ILO. Well, Mr. President, there are some foolish proposals advanced in every organization—even in the Congress of the United States; but I never heard of an individual's refusing to serve in Congress because of that fact. The truth is that most of the foolish proposals in the ILO meet the same fate as those in Congress: They are buried, and never are adopted.

The few which may be adopted can be harmful to the United States only to the extent that we ourselves are foolish enough to put them into effect. This fact destroys the validity of Mr. McGrath's second major complaint, which is that the ILO is an international law-making body bent upon legislating socialism into existence throughout the world. This can only be described as plain nonsense. The ILO has no power whatsoever over any sovereign country on the face of the world. The ILO can only act through recommendations, which do not have to be followed, or through conventions, which do not have to be ratified, and which, of course, are not binding unless they are ratified.

Finally, Mr. McGrath complains that the employer and worker delegates from the Soviet Union and other Communist countries are, in fact, merely additional government delegates, and do not represent free employers and free workers. This is a valid point, and I disagree with Mr. McGrath only as to the conclusion to be drawn from it. He thinks we ought to get out of the ILO. I think we ought to stay in it, and fight harder than ever to show up this Communist fiction for what it is.

Incidentally, Mr. President, I may say that at the present time there is within the International Labor Organization a subcommittee looking into the matter of so-called employer representation on the part of the Communist states which happen to be members of the Organization.

I am not alone in believing that we should remain in the ILO. The executive council of the AFL-CIO thinks so. It recently said:

We regard the ILO as a vital forum through which to promote the cause of freedom and democracy in the world. We take this opportunity to officially reiterate our full and unqualified support of the ILO and of United States membership and active participation therein.

We urge the Congress of the United States to enact Senate Joint Resolution 97.

The Catholic Church thinks so. I quote from an editorial of March 16, 1956, issue of the *New World*, official Catholic paper of the archdiocese of Chicago and the diocese of Joliet:

The Holy See has been one of the ILO's strongest supporters from the very beginning of the Organization. In November 1954, the Holy Father enthusiastically welcomed the members of the ILO governing body in a special audience at the Vatican and, echoing the sentiments of his predecessor, vigorously endorsed the important work that they are doing for the cause of social justice. \* \* \*

Moreover, as recently as January of this year, a French Jesuit, Father Joblin, was appointed to the staff of the ILO with the advice and consent of the Holy See. \* \* \* The fact that Father Joblin's appointment was made long after the problem of Communist representation in the ILO became a public issue is an obvious indication that the Holy See is not in favor of scuttling the Organization merely because of the fact that Russia and some of her satellites are included in its membership.

Further, Mr. President, as recently as April 4, less than 2 weeks ago, the economic subcommittee of the Catholic Association for International Peace found that American withdrawal from the ILO "would play directly into the hands of the Communists."

Finally, Mr. President, the Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers—the two groups who nominate our employer delegate—have decided to continue their participation this year. Although they are not without some misgivings about the matter, they have rejected Mr. McGrath's proposal for immediate withdrawal from the ILO.

Mr. President, let me say just a word about the paragraph of the joint resolution relating to the Food and Agriculture Organization. I think there would be general agreement that this agency has done one of the best jobs of any of the UN specialized agencies. It certainly has one of the most important jobs—namely, that of keeping food production up with population increases in underdeveloped countries.

The FAO Conference last fall voted a budget of \$6.6 million for 1956 and of \$6.8 million for 1957. The vote, incidentally, was 24 to 23, with the United States voting "No." After taking account of small miscellaneous income, the amount of these budgets which will have to be met by assessments is \$6.5 million in 1956 and \$6.7 million in 1957. The United States assessment for each of these years is 31.5 percent. These assessments can be met within the existing ceiling by taking advantage of a credit which has accrued to the United States in the FAO Working Capital Fund.

It is apparent, however, that the United States is operating on a very thin margin, that our 1958 assessment will breach our ceiling, that the ceiling would therefore have to be raised next year, and that in the meantime our whole position in the FAO will be strengthened by timely action to raise the ceiling now.

Mr. President, the amounts of money involved here are not large. The total increase provided for by this resolution to be spread over a period of years is less than half of one one-thousandth of the unexpended balances of appropriations for military assistance. The amount involved here appear even more trifling when considered in relation to the damage our international position would suffer if we were to fail to play our full part in both the ILO and FAO.

I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee unanimously reported the joint resolution. I know I express the hope of the chairman and of others